

ON BROADER LINES

Progress of the Senatorial Hawaiian
Investigation Committee

PROF. ALEXANDER FURTHER TESTIFIES

The Causes That Led to the Revolution

NOT ALLIED TO DELEGATE

The Senate committee on foreign relations began the fourth day of the investigation of Hawaiian affairs by meeting all most at the hour appointed, 10, this morning, and with all members of the subcommittee present but Mr. Sherman. Prof. Alexander, the surveyor general of the islands, was the only witness before the committee this morning.

One thing appears to be evident, if the intimations dropped by members of the committee are true, that the committee can serve as basis for a statement and that is that the scope of the investigation is taking a much wider range than was anticipated by the witnesses or even by the Senators when they began the work. It

said that Mr. Morgan, chairman of the committee, in discussing the plan of action informed his colleagues that there were questions in this matter far deeper than the mere acts of ex-Minister Stevens, Minister Willis and Commissioner Blount, and those questions related to the causes that led to the acts of these gentlemen.

Mr. Willis' Report Not Received.

The indications are that the State Department has not up to this time given the committee a copy of the report made by Mr. Willis, upon which the supplemental charges

Wills, upon which the supplemental instructions were sent to the jury on December 3 last, were sent to the jury to consider and the endeavor of the committee has been to get at the facts and the condition of the affairs when Mr. Wills arrived at the hospital and what it could have been that the report and that prevented the consummation of the plan contemplated in the instructions as carried with him, based upon the report submitted by Commissioner Bount. Much of the testimony of Prof. Alexander has been devoted to a discussion of the constitutional question, and at least one member of the jury has stated that he was unable to follow the testimony of Prof. Alexander, and the committee is of the opinion that the jury should be instructed to consider the facts and the condition of the affairs when Mr. Wills arrived at the hospital and what it could have been that the report and that prevented the consummation of the plan contemplated in the instructions as carried with him, based upon the report submitted by Commissioner Bount.

Lacking in Mr. Blount's Report.

It was stated by him that that report ignored the causes that led to the revolution and dismissed the subject of the new constitution the queen sought to establish with but the most reserved reference. The claim made so generally by the friends of the provisional government that this constitution was the last of a series of efforts to defeat the establishment of a progressive government and improve the condition of the whole people, omitted its cause.

Ascertaining the Causes.
The committee, therefore, have undertaken the task themselves, and a great part of the testimony of Prof. Alexander has been in that direction. He gave a thorough review of the various acts of the queen and of the legislature, and in response to specific questions by members of the committee, especially by Mr. Frye and Mr. Morgan, explained the conditions that

existed prior to the outspoken denunciation of the queen's government and the succeeding uprising and appointment of the committee of safety. The inquiry was directed along this line for the purpose of ascertaining how far the people were justified in imagining themselves to be possessed of a grievance, representative of the subsequent acts of government. In this connection it was stated that the committee has in mind the statement made some days ago by Prof. William Libbey, Jr., a friend of the administration and its policy (which statement, it is un-

derstood, has been called to the attention of the committee, who has just returned from a trip to the Hawaiian Islands. Mr. Libbey recognized that the landing of the United States troops at the queen's behest had been a necessary step to abdicate and enabled the provisional government to get control, described the situation as follows:

Prof. Libbey's Statement.

"On the one hand was an unscrupulous queen, and on the other an honest set of men, who are working solely for the highest interests of Hawaii. They are men of great business ability, and by their enterprise have been able to bring about the present situation."

She was a monarch for revenue only, to use our phrase. She tried to carry out a decision to legalize the opium traffic, in order to increase her private revenues. She made her last attempt by virtually trying to dispossess the foreign citizens in attempting to change the constitution. She was backed down in that enterprise. The foreign citizens were uncertain what would come next. She prorogued parliament, and

There would be no further session for two years. Nobody knew what would come next. Everybody believed the queen to be unscrupulous. The Americans were forced into the thing by circumstances, and therefore would have been no trouble if Minister Stevens had only kept his hands off. He was anxious. If he had not jumped in at that time and brought forward the troops the thing would have settled itself in a natural way, and, I think, without any serious difficulty."

Prof. Alexander's Testimony.

Prof. Alexander's evidence bore directly upon this matter, not as corroborative

the statement of Prof. Libbey, which, it is understood, was not referred to as such, but upon the conditions that existed at the time and caused Prof. Libbey to publish his statement. These matters were all familiar to Prof. Alexander, and his knowledge of the constitution and law of the State enabled him to give the committee a full and explicit explanation, from his point of view, at least, of all that antedated the revolution.

The Exciting Events Described.

It was with considerable detail that Prof. Alexander described the events of the ex-

edding times when the queen was deposed, and in this part of his evidence disputed the report of Mr. Blount. He was questioned by all the members of the committee and the widest range was given to this witness, as to every other witness, in permitting him to tell his story. He described the landing of the troops from the Boston shore they went to the property of Mr. J. H. Atherton, an American, but there being no accommodation for them, they were stationed in Arden Hall, which was some

that any of the troops were drawn up in line when the proclamation was read, the only troops visible being those which lounged on the veranda of the building they occupied. Prof. Alexander said he had a son-in-law in one of the companies and knew some of the officers, but none of whom had talked with the local force who did not expect any help from the United States forces, on the contrary, they had been told that they could expect nothing. They were given to understand that they must take care of themselves. The men, he said, expected to fight, and were ready to die. When the proclamation was read, there were no

proclamation was read there were no troops in front of the building, but by the time it was finished, he said, a company of Ger-